

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 27, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, amendments have been made in the claims, and each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The claims as presented are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-54 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 18-29, 35-37 and 52-54 are amended herein. Claims 55-69 are added. No claims are cancelled. As a result, claims 1-69 are pending for examination, with claims 1, 18, 35 and 52-54 being independent. No new matter has been added.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,122,635 to Burakoff et al. ("Burakoff"). Burakoff is commonly assigned with the present application, and Applicants are well aware of the system described by Burakoff. As amended herein, claims 1-69 patentably distinguish over Burakoff.

#### A. Claims 1-12, 55-59

As amended herein, claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method comprising acts of: (A) executing a set of programmed instructions on a source file to identify a source location within the source file, the source location comprising at least a portion of the source file containing a data element; (B) storing an indication of the source location; (C) receiving a request, from a user viewing a file other than the source file, to retrieve the data element at the source location; and (D) employing the indication of the source location to retrieve the data element at the source location.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 provided herein may be found in Applicants' specification at, for example, p.16, line 3 – p.17, line 26.

Burakoff fails to satisfy the totality of limitations recited by amended claim 1. For example, Burakoff fails to disclose or suggest receiving a request, from a user viewing a file

other than a source file on which a set of programmed instructions is executed to identify a source location therein, to retrieve a data element at the source location, or and employing an indication of the source location to retrieve the data element at the source location.

Burakoff discloses a technique for mapping compliance information into a useable format (Abstract). In particular, the system may acquire securities submissions from one or more database sources and extract compliance information for individual securities from those securities submissions (Abstract). At various points in the process, the system allows users to view either the securities submission or the extracted compliance information. For example, a system operator may view a securities submission and supply information which allows compliance information to be identified and/or catalogued, such as line numbers defining the start and end of the compliance information, and/or the security to which the compliance information is related (col. 7, line 51 – col. 8, line 17). A system operator also may view a securities submission to identify its effective date (col. 8, lines 29-41). Further, a user may verify that work has been performed correctly by other users on the securities submission (col. 9, lines 1-29). After extraction of the compliance information occurs, a user may issue a query to compliance information server 325 (FIG. 5) to retrieve information for a particular security by supplying a unique identifier for the security, such as an internal identifier, CUSIP or stock ticker symbol (col. 10, lines 29-31).

Burakoff fails to disclose or suggest receiving a request, from a user viewing a file other than a source file on which a set of programmed instructions is executed to identify a source location therein, to retrieve a data element at the source location. Burakoff discloses that programmed instructions are executed on a securities submission to identify compliance information therein. However, Burakoff does not disclose or suggest receiving a request from a user viewing a file other than the securities submission to retrieve a data element at a particular location within the securities submission, and does not disclose or suggest employing any indication of a source location to perform a retrieval, as required by claim 1. The system of Burakoff simply fails to provide this capability.

As a result, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Burakoff, such that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by Burakoff should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-12 and 55-59 depend from claim 1 and allowable for at least the same reasons.

B. Claims 18-29, 60-64

Claim 18 recites at least one computer-readable medium having instructions recorded thereon which, when executed by a computer system, perform a method substantially similar to claim 1. For the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Burakoff, such that the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by Burakoff should be withdrawn.

Claims 19-29 and 60-64 depend from claim 18 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

C. Claims 35-46, 65-69

Claim 35 recites a system comprising, *inter alia*, receipt means for receiving a request, from a user viewing a file other than a source file, to retrieve the data element at the source location, and retrieval means for employing the indication of the source location to retrieve the data element at the source location. It should be appreciated from the discussion above in relation to claim 1 that Burakoff fails to disclose or suggest a system which satisfies the limitations of claim 35. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by Burakoff should be withdrawn.

Claims 36-46 and 65-69 depend from claim 35 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

D. Claim 52

Claim 52 recites a method of accessing at least one data element at a source location. The method comprises receiving a request from a user to access the source location, the source location comprising at least a portion of a source file containing the at least one data element, the source location having been identified via an execution of a set of programmed instructions, the source file comprising a securities filing, the request being received from a user viewing a file

other than the source file; retrieving an indication of the source location from electronic file storage; processing the indication to access the source location; and presenting the at least one data element stored at the source location to the user.

It should be appreciated from the discussion above in relation to claim 1 that Burakoff fails to disclose or suggest a method which satisfies the limitations of claim 52. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by Burakoff should be withdrawn.

E. Claim 53

Claim 53 recites at least one computer-readable medium having instructions recorded thereon which, when executed, perform a method substantially similar to claim 52. For the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 52, claim 53 patentably distinguishes over Burakoff, such that the rejection of claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by Burakoff should be withdrawn.

F. Claim 54

Claim 54 recites a system for accessing at least one data element stored at a source location. The system comprises, inter alia, request receipt means for receiving a request from a user to access the source location, the source location comprising at least a portion of a file containing the at least one data element, the source location having been identified via an execution of a set of programmed instructions, the file comprising a securities filing, the request being received from a user viewing a file other than the source file.

It should be appreciated from the discussion above in relation to claims 1 and 52 that Burakoff fails to disclose or suggest a system which satisfies the limitations of claim 54. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by Burakoff should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the application in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: May 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Randy J. Pritzker

Randy J. Pritzker

Registration No.: 35,986

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

(617) 646-8000